



## **Regional Service Council Minutes Region #6**

**Meeting Date:** 5-3-06

**Meeting Location:** Teleconference

**Council Members Present:** At Miami County: Chair Glynn Hipp, DCS Regional Manager; Fay Russell, Miami DCS Director; Margie Justice, Wabash DCS Director; Marilyn Robinson, Howard CPS Supervisor; Ramona Mahoney, Fulton FCM

At Cass County: Judge Julian Ridlen: Barbara Hendrickson, GAL

At Howard County: Judge Lynn Murray

At Fulton County: Judge Douglas Morton

**Council Members Absent:** Ruby Troglen, Fulton Foster Parent

**Others In Attendance:** Judge Robert McCallen, Wabash; M.B. Lippold, DCS Director of Programs, Indianapolis; Jim Shively, IV-B Coordinator; Anita Closson, Cass DCS Director; Kay McGinnis, Whites

<h3><b>Meeting Minutes</b></h3>
---------------------------------

**Meeting Called to Order at:** 4:00 PM by Chair Glynn Hipp

The Council had a quorum present

1. An apology was given by the Chair as the meeting minutes for 4-5-06 were sent out just that afternoon. The review of the minutes will be held at the next meeting on June 7<sup>th</sup>. Judge Ridlen noted that the proper term is “moved” not “motioned”.
2. Jim Shively gave a summary of the current negotiations for the Intensive Family Preservation (IFP) and Intensive Family Reunification Programs. Service standards are being re-written and rates negotiated. Judge Morton asked about how these standards applied to a program in Fulton County. It

was later established that this particular vendor bid under a different category. M.B. Lippold clarified that the IFP/ IFR programs could consist of caseloads of 1 or 2 families at 20 hours per week each, blended caseloads are possible, interventions are expected to last 4 to 6 weeks, and they are evidence based programs based on the Homebuilders model. The State will provide training to providers.

3. Chair Glynn Hipp updated the Council on the proposals for Community Partners services. There were three proposals offering two models. County Directors scored the proposals with Children's Bureau (CB) proposal the highest. For funds available to Region 6, CB would place one program manager and two case managers in an office central to the region to try to serve the entire region. A governing body needs to be selected with representation from each county for the program. There was much discussion about this proposal.

Comments included:

- a. The proposal does not appear to be community based.
  - b. There doesn't appear to be capability to cover the region adequately.
  - c. Some communities already have elements of the Community Partners program in place.
  - d. Referrals may come back to the same programs that DCS refers to already.
4. At the request of the Chair, three programs were discussed that already exist in Miami, Wabash and Cass counties.
    - a. Miami has a wrap around program operated by 4-County Mental Health. It operates much as the CB proposal would and, because of Child Welfare Services Funding, accepts all referrals. There are two workers in the program but another is needed. The program is strength based but outcomes are not tracked.
    - b. Wabash had a program that was operated by several agencies on a voluntary basis. It has devolved back to the DCS office and is essentially a Voluntary Services program. There is use of IV-E Waiver and Medicaid to pay for services.
    - c. Judge Ridlen discussed the Family Opportunity Center in Logansport where a variety of programs are offered including parenting training, intensive day treatment, and alternative school.
  5. There was additional discussion of the Community Partners program and the CB proposal.

Points discussed included:

- a.. More information is needed about the CB proposal and where are the

- funds going to come from?
  - b. It's possible to build on existing programs.
  - c. The Community Partners program differs in structure between urban and rural areas.
  - d. The program must work for each community.
  - e. The CB proposal as it is does not appear to meet this region's needs.
  - f. If communities are already provided services similar to Community Partners, why is an extra layer needed?
  - g. The current voluntary services program provides the same services available to CHINS cases.
  - h. Community Partners can assure a consistent array of services across the region.
  - i. Existing programs do minimal outcome assessments which CP requires to be done.
  - j. There is little done in the way of up-front assessment of families who need prevention services – CP can provide this.
  - k. Will we have a record of families that fail Community Partners?
6. There was discussion of the projected end date for the DCS Voluntary Services program which is 9-1-06. M.B. is working to make that date more flexible.
7. Additional points were discussed as follows:
- a. What should the Community Partners program look like in each county?
  - b. How will it be implemented?
  - c. Do we need it in every county?
  - d. How does funding affect existing programs?
  - e. If not implemented in every county initially, how does this coordinate with the end of voluntary services and funding in those counties that don't implement first?
8. There was discussion of the model presented by another provider that appears to be more appropriate for Region 6 as it partners with existing local programs. Can the Regional Manager approach CB about using a different approach in Region 6?
9. Issues to be considered include:
- a. What will work for each community?
  - b. We need to start deciding who would be on the Community Partners governing body.

**Next Meeting Date, Location and Time:** June 7, 4:00 p.m., in Miami County

**Meeting Adjourned at:** approximately 5:35 p.m.